

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claim 14 was allowed, and Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 15-22 were rejected over the prior art, principally U.S. Patent Application no. 2002/0038299 A1 (Zernick, et al.). Also, the Examiner objected to the language of Claim 1 and rejected Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

With respect to the rejection of the claims over the prior art, Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. being fully anticipated by Zernick, et al; and Claims 12, 13, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Zernick, et al. Claims 4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Zernick, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,182,090 (Peairs).

Independent Claims 1, 7, 11, 15 and 18 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. Claim 1 is also being amended to address the Examiner's objection to the claim language, and Claim 7 is being amended to overcome the rejection of Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 3 and 4 are being amended to better define the features described in these claims, and Claims 16 and 17 are being cancelled to reduce the number of issues in this case.

For the reasons set forth below, Claims 1 and 7-9 are clear and definite and fully meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to Claim 1 and the rejection of Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112. In addition, Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-22 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Examiner is thus respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-22 over the prior art, and to allow these claims.

In objecting to the language of Claim 1, the Examiner noted that the phrase "the a" occurs in line 5 of the claim. This opportunity is being taken to delete the "a" in this phrase. Accordingly, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the language of Claim 1.

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 because there was no clear antecedent basis for the phrase "the information and weighted values," which occurred in lines 6 and 7 of Claim 7. Claim 7 is being amended to more positively introduce the feature of assigning weighted values to the topics, and this provides the appropriate antecedent basis for the phrase "the weighted values assigned to the determined topics," occurring later in the claim.

In view of this change, Claim 7 and Claims 8 and 9, which are dependent from Claim 7, are clear and definite and fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. The Examiner is, hence, requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

With regard to the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103, Applicants believe that in order to better explain the differences between the claims and the prior art, it may be helpful to summarize briefly this invention and the prior art.

The present invention generally relates to methods and systems for displaying icons representing text files. This helps a user find data files in which they are interested. In one embodiment of the invention, a content extractor determines a plurality of topics of a text file, and each of a plurality of icons is associated with a respective one of those topics. Weighted

values are assigned to each of those topics, and a selector selects at least one of the icons to represent the text file on the basis of the weighted values assigned to the topics.

Zernick, et al. discloses systems and procedures for showing icons that represent data pages. In this procedure, pages are associated with categories, which can be represented by icons. More specifically, as discussed in Zernick, et al. in paragraph 64, a signature is assigned to each page, and the categories most closely related to the signature for each page are identified and assigned a weight. These weighted categories are then evaluated to determine how to group the web pages.

One very important difference between the preferred embodiment of this invention and Zernick, et al. relates to the way in which the icons are determined for a page. While both Zernick, et al. and this invention involve the use of weighted values, the specific ways in which these weighted values are used are quite different. With this invention, the weighted values are assigned to topics, and the icons are selected based on those weighted values. In Zernick, et al, weights are assigned to categories, and the pages are assigned to categories based on the weighted values.

The approach of this invention is of utility because it is better able, in comparison to Zernick, et al, to match icons with the content of the text file or page.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 11 and 18 describe important features of the preferred embodiment of the invention that are not shown in or suggested by Zernick, et al. For example, Claim 1 describes means for assigning weight values to each of a plurality of topics of a text file, and a selector for selecting at least one of a plurality of icons to represent the text file on the basis of the weighted values assigned to said topics.

Claims 7 and 11 describe similar features. In particular, Claim 7 describes a module and Claim 11 describes a matcher for performing similar functions – for associating a respective one of a plurality of icons with each of a plurality of topics of a text file, assigning weighted values to each of said plurality of topics, and means for selecting icons to represent the file based on the weighted values assigned to the identified topics. Claim 18, which is directed to a computer program for effecting method steps for determining and displaying icons, describes analogous method limitations.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and whether these other references are considered individually or in combination, they also fail to teach or suggest the use of weighted values in the manner described in Claims 1, 7, 11 and 18.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 7, 11 and 18 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these Claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-6 and 20-22 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 8 and 9 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 7. Likewise, claims 12 and 13 are dependent from Claim 11 and are allowable therewith, and Claim 19 is dependent from Claim 18 and is allowable therewith. The Examiner is, thus, respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102, and the rejections of Claims 4, 12, 13, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-9, 11-13 and 18-22.

With respect to Claim 15, this Claim is being amended to describe in more detail the way in which a composite icon is formed and used. Specifically, with this feature, as described in Claim 15, the icons in the composite icon are used to point to the different parts of the text that the icons represent.

The use of the icons to point to different parts of the text also is not shown or taught by the prior art.

Zernick, et al. as the Examiner has recognized, does not show the use of composite icons. While Pearis, in a very general sense, discloses a procedure in which multiple icons are used, this reference does not teach providing the icons with the above-discussed pointing feature.

This feature is useful because, as will be understood, it helps a user quickly find the part of the text file in which the user is particularly interested.

The other references of record have been considered, and these other references also do not suggest or teach this feature, as described in Claim 15.

Thus, Claim 15 also patentably distinguishes over the prior art and is allowable, and the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow this claim.

For the reasons discussed above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the language of Claim 1 and the rejection of Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112. The Examiner is also respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102, and the rejections of Claims 4, 12, 13, 15, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15 and 18-22.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKewed/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.